



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/577,775	04/28/2006	Tae-Yoon Kim	0070777-000021	9809
21839	7590	07/07/2009	EXAMINER	
BUCHANAN, INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC			MONSHIPOURI, MARYAM	
POST OFFICE BOX 1404				
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1656	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/07/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ADIPFDD@bipc.com

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/577,775	KIM ET AL.	

Examiner	Art Unit	
Maryam Monshipouri	1656	

All Participants:

Status of Application: _____

(1) Maryam Monshipouri.

(3) ____.

(2) Ms. Susan Dadio.

(4) ____.

Date of Interview: 15 June 2009

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

102/103

Claims discussed:

7, 24

Prior art documents discussed:

US Patent No. 6,011,067

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

On 6/15/09 Ms. Lisa Stall called the examiner to indicate that the interview summary mentioned in the office action of 6/9/09 was not received by applicant. The examiner expressed regret for the inadvertent error and promised Ms. Stall to send applicant a summary of Ms. Dadio's communications with the examiner as following:

On 6/9/09 the examiner called Ms. Dadio to suggest ways to amend base claim 7 such that it would overcome the cited art (see above Patent, cited previously) and mentioned that claim 24 as written is not allowable. However, during the course of interview both the examiner and applicant reached the conclusion that a new office action is necessary.

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Maryam Monshipouri/
 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1656

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

